



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,883	10/22/2003	James A. Fisher	TUC920030096US1	6818
46244 7590 11/14/2007 LAW OFFICE OF CHARLES W. PETERSON, JR. TUCSON 435B Carlisle Dr. Herndon, VA 20170			EXAMINER PHAM, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT 2167	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/14/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/690,883

Applicant(s)

FISHER ET AL.

Examiner

Michael D. Pham

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

Status of claims

1. Claims 8-25 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 8, 11, 13, 14, 17, and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 2003/0014442 by Shiigi et. al. (hereafter Shiigi) further in view of U.S. Patent 6,424,980 by Iizuka et. al. (hereafter Iizuka).**

Claim 8:

Shiigi discloses the following claimed limitations:

“a data generation module generating variable data” (instances of content objects are created) “for display;” (content objects that will appear or be used on the web page) [0039, “..content objects that will appear or be used on the web pages.” and “instances of content objects are created in the object model.”.].

“a collection of hypertext mark up language (HTML) template files” (templates)”, ones of said HTML template files including placeholders in markup text for dynamic input data;” (templates..include tags as placeholders for content objects to be incorporated in documents) [Abstract, “The templates specify the structure of the document and include tags as placeholders for content objects to be incorporated in the document”. That is, a collection.]

“a page generation module selectively providing HTML documents” (page serving process)
“from said HTML template files, said page generation module combining said variable data with said placeholders in selected said ones; and” [0020, page serving process begins by retrieving the template hierarchy data and using the data to construct a table object represents the combined HTML, runtime script, and object tags for the associated template hierarchy.]

Shiigi discloses, 0020, a table object represents the combined HTML, runtime script, and object tags for the associated template hierarchy. That this table object, “incorporates all tagged content and objects that are inherited from the parent templates and extensions as well as those tags which have not been defined in the template hierarchy”. 0089, states that “both content (web objects) and structural elements (templates, extensions, documents) are stored as entries inside of a virtual file system”. That this “virtual file system is implemented as a set of index tables inside of a database instance in a relational database manager”. Hence, Shiigi suggests “each of said data generation module and said page generation module including a page pointer table with a single entry for each of said html template files.” As for there is a page pointer table (index tables) with a single entry for each of said html template files (structural elements stored as entries).

Shiigi further suggests as seen in figure 4, a table containing for each template (template such as element 72A) a corresponding data structure (such as elements within table 78) and a page map (e.g. tag list left column in table 76A/B) from the tabular data (e.g. tags within body of html template). One of ordinary skill would easily recognize that html documents are based on displayed data in tables. Hence the body of html is essentially tabular lists of data (tags within the body of html as seen in figure 4).

However, although it is suggested by Shiigi, Shiigi does not explicitly disclose “each said single entry for each of said ones pointing to a corresponding repeatable data structure and a page map for tabular data lists in said corresponding repeatable data structure, said tabular data lists being displayed as a table on a generated said HTML document.”

On the other hand, Iizuka discloses figure 11 and 12 discloses an html document table and HTML document to table mapping table. Hence suggesting “each said single entry for each of said ones pointing to a corresponding repeatable data structure and page map” (figure 12, each entry in the mapping table contains repeatable data structure and a page map) “for tabular data lists in said corresponding repeatable data structure, said tabular data lists being displayed as a table on a generated html document.” (col. 15 lines 47-48, sets data for converting elements contained in the HTML documents into a table in the HTML document (tabular data lists being displayed as a table on a generated html document) to table mapping table) .

Both Shiigi and Iizuka are within the same field of endeavor. That is, generating web applications. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shiigi to have included an html document table and html document to table mapping table based on the disclosure of Iizuka for the purpose of providing a more organized method of mapping data for html documents. Thereby improving web application generation.

Claim 11:

Iizuka, “wherein at least one said page map includes a plurality of entries” (figure 12, see table entries) “, each of said plurality of entries pointing to a corresponding one of said tabular data lists” (figure 12, see columns 2-4. columns 2-4 corresponds to tabular data lists.).

Claim 13:

Shiigi, “wherein design responsibility for each of said data generation module, said page generation module and said HTML template files is assignable to a different design group” [0099, users are able to edit both the structure and content of the website].

Claim 14:

Shiigi discloses the following claimed limitations:

“a data generation module generating variable data” (instances of content objects are created) “for display;” (content objects that will appear or be used on the web page) [0039, “..content objects that will appear or be used on the web pages.” and “instances of content objects are created in the object model.”].

“a hypertext mark up language (HTML) template file collection” (templates)”, ones of said HTML template files including placeholders in markup text for dynamic input data;” (templates..include tags as placeholders for content objects to be incorporated in documents) [Abstract, “The templates specify the structure of the document and include tags as placeholders for content objects to be incorporated in the document”. That is, a collection.]

“a page generation module selectively providing HTML documents” (page serving process) “from said HTML template files, said page generation module combining said variable data with said placeholders in selected said ones; and” (0020, page serving process begins by retrieving the template hierarchy data and using the data to construct a table object represents the combined HTML, runtime script, and object tags for the associated template hierarchy.)

Shiigi discloses, 0020, a table object represents the combined HTML, runtime script, and object tags for the associated template hierarchy. That this table object, “incorporates all tagged content and objects that are inherited from the parent templates and extensions as well as those tags which have not been defined in the template hierarchy”. 0089, states that “both content (web objects) and structural elements (templates, extensions, documents) are stored as entries inside of a virtual file system”. That this “virtual file system is implemented as a set of index tables inside of a database instance in a relational database manager”. Hence, Shiigi suggests “each of said data generation module and said page generation module including a page pointer table with a single entry for each of said html template files.” As for there is a page pointer table (index tables) with a single entry for each of said html template files (structural elements stored as entries).

Shiigi further suggests as seen in figure 4, a table containing for each template (template such as element 72A) a corresponding data structure (such as elements within table 78) and a page map (e.g. tag list left column in table 76A/B) from the tabular data (e.g. tags within body of html template). One of ordinary skill would easily recognize that html documents are based on displayed data in tables. Hence the body of html is essentially tabular lists of data (tags within the body of html as seen in figure 4).

However, although it is suggested by Shiigi, Shiigi does not explicitly disclose “each said single entry for each of said ones pointing to a corresponding repeatable data structure and a page map for tabular data lists in said corresponding repeatable data structure, said tabular data lists being displayed as a table on a generated said HTML document.”

On the other hand, Iizuka discloses figure 11 and 12 discloses an html document table and HTML document to table mapping table. Hence suggesting “each said single entry for each of said ones pointing to a corresponding repeatable data structure and page map” (figure 12, each entry in the mapping table contains repeatable data structure and a page map) “for tabular data lists in said corresponding repeatable data structure, said tabular data lists being displayed as a table on a generated html document.” (col. 15 lines 47-48, sets data for converting elements contained in the HTML documents into a table in the HTML document (tabular data lists being displayed as a table on a generated html document) to table mapping table) .

Both Shiigi and Iizuka are within the same field of endeavor. That is, generating web applications. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shiigi to have included an html document table and html document to table mapping table based on the disclosure of Iizuka for the purpose of providing a more organized method of mapping data for html documents. Thereby improving web application generation.

Claim 17:

Shiiga discloses the following claimed limitations:

“computer readable program code means for generating variable data for display and storing generated said variable data according to a page pointer table,” [0039, “..content objects that will appear or be used on the web pages.” and “instances of content objects are created in the object model.”. Figure 4, stored content repository according to tag list.]

“said page pointer table having a single entry for each of a plurality of hypertext mark up language (HTML) files,”[Figure 4, tag list 76 contains single entry for each of a plurality of hypertext markup language html files.]

“computer readable program code means for defining said plurality of HTML files;”[abstract, defines templates, extensions, documents, and content objects in template inheritance model.]

“computer readable program code means for selectively generating HTML documents from defined said HTML files and stored said variable data. “[0020, page serving process begins by retrieving the template hierarchy data and using the data to construct a table object represents the combined HTML, runtime script, and object tags for the associated template hierarchy.]

Shiigi further suggests as seen in figure 4, a table containing for each template (template such as element 72A) a corresponding data structure (such as elements within table 78) and a page map (e.g. tag list left column in table 76A/B) from the tabular data (e.g. tags within body of html template). One of ordinary skill would easily recognize that html documents are based on displayed data in tables. Hence the body of html is essentially tabular lists of data (tags within the body of html as seen in figure 4).

However, although it is suggested by Shiigi, Shiigi does not explicitly disclose “each said single entry pointing to a corresponding repeatable data structure and a page map for tabular data lists in said corresponding repeatable data structure, said tabular data lists listing said generated data;”

On the other hand, Iizuka discloses figure 11 and 12 discloses an html document table and HTML document to table mapping table. Hence suggesting “each said single entry for each of said ones pointing to a corresponding repeatable data structure and page map” (figure 12, each entry in the mapping table

contains repeatable data structure and a page map) “for tabular data lists in said corresponding repeatable data structure, said tabular data lists being displayed as a table on a generated html document.” (col. 15 lines 47-48, sets data for converting elements contained in the HTML documents into a table in the HTML document (tabular data lists being displayed as a table on a generated html document) to table mapping table) .

Both Shiigi and Iizuka are within the same field of endeavor. That is, generating web applications. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shiigi to have included an html document table and html document to table mapping table based on the disclosure of Iizuka for the purpose of providing a more organized method of mapping data for html documents. Thereby improving web application generation.

Claim 20:

Shiigi discloses “wherein said data generation module generates variable data from system parameters for a monitored system.” [0039, whereas an object represents a type of element on a webpage and serves as a placeholder, a resource is the actual content element referenced by the placeholder, such as text, graphics, video or animation files.]

Claim 21:

Shiigi discloses “wherein said data generation module receives and formats raw data for a system and stores formatted system data in a local data store “[0039, object model which generates documents in response to client requests in a client/server network. The overall framework of the system is an objected-oriented environment consisting of templates, objects, documents, and resources which are used by the object model to generate webpages. Templates are structural

elements that define the visual and programmatic structure of a webpage or set of webpages for a particular web site application, by specifying the formatting of the webpages and the content objects that will appear or be used on the webpages. 0043, the archiver 20B is used to archive data generated by the object model and to import data to or export data from the repositories.]

Claim 22:

Shiigi discloses “wherein said data generation module generates variable data from system parameters for a monitored system” [0039, whereas an object represents a type of element on a webpage and serves as a placeholder, a resource is the actual content element referenced by the placeholder, such as text, graphics, video or animation files.]

Claim 23:

Shiigi discloses “wherein said data generation module generates variable data from system parameters for a monitored system.” [0039, object model which generates documents in response to client requests in a client/server network. The overall framework of the system is an objected-oriented environment consisting of templates, objects, documents, and resources which are used by the object model to generate webpages. Templates are structural elements that define the visual and programmatic structure of a webpage or set of webpages for a particular web site application, by specifying the formatting of the webpages and the content objects that will appear or be used on the webpages. 0043, the archiver 20B is used to archive data generated by the object model and to import data to or export data from the repositories.]

Claim 24:

Shiigi discloses “wherein computer readable program code means for generating variable data comprises computer readable program code means for receiving system parameters for a monitored system and generating said variable data from received said system parameters.”

[0039, whereas an object represents a type of element on a webpage and serves as a placeholder, a resource is the actual content element referenced by the placeholder, such as text, graphics, video or animation files.]

Claim 25:

Shiigi discloses “wherein computer readable program code means for generating variable data comprises computer readable program code means for formatting raw data for a system” [0039, object model which generates documents in response to client requests in a client/server network. The overall framework of the system is an objected-oriented environment consisting of templates, objects, documents, and resources which are used by the object model to generate webpages. Templates are structural elements that define the visual and programmatic structure of a webpage or set of webpages for a particular web site application, by specifying the formatting of the webpages and the content objects that will appear or be used on the webpages. 0043, the archiver 20B is used to archive data generated by the object model and to import data to or export data from the repositories.]

4. **Claims 9, 10, 12, 15-16, 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 2003/0014442 by Shiigi et. al. (hereafter Shiigi) further in view of U.S. Patent 6,424,980 by**

Iizuka et. al. (hereafter Iizuka) and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0138509 by Burrows et. al. (hereafter Burrows).

Claim 9:

Shiigi and Iizuka do not explicitly disclose “wherein adding HTML template files increases the size of each of said data generation module and said page generation module only by the length of a corresponding said single entry for each said added HTML template file.”

However Burrows discloses 0004 that if the number of web pages in the network is large, the amount of memory required to store the url’s and links in the web database will be correspondingly large. Further disclosing 0041 there is the ability to put a limit on the length of reference chains for decompressing a row.

Shiigi, Iizuka, and Burrows are all directed to web enabled systems. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Burrow’s teachings of “0004 that if the number of web pages in the network is large, the amount of memory required to store the url’s and links in the web database will be correspondingly large. Further disclosing 0041 there is the ability to put a limit on the length of reference chains for decompressing a row” to Shiigi’s and Iizuka’s system in order to provide a method of efficiently storing web applications.

Claim 10:

Shiigi and Iizuka do not explicitly disclose “wherein each said single entry further includes a number indicating the length of said page map. ”

However Burrows discloses 0004 that if the number of web pages in the network is large, the amount of memory required to store the url’s and links in the web database will be correspondingly large. Further disclosing 0041 there is the ability to put a limit on the length of reference chains for decompressing a row.

Shiigi, Iizuka, and Burrows are all directed to web enabled systems. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Burrow's teachings of "0004 that if the number of web pages in the network is large, the amount of memory required to store the url's and links in the web database will be correspondingly large. Further disclosing 0041 there is the ability to put a limit on the length of reference chains for decompressing a row" to Shiigi's and Iizuka's system in order to provide a method of efficiently storing web applications.

Claim 12:

Shiigi and Iizuka do not explicitly disclose "wherein each entry in said plurality of entries includes an offset from a first listed data element and a number of listed data elements in said corresponding one."

However Burrows, 0065, discloses an offset for a corresponding row. Further disclosing that the offset is used to facilitate link database compression.

Shiigi, Iizuka, and Burrows are all directed to web enabled systems. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Burrow's teachings of "0065, discloses an offset for a corresponding row. Further disclosing that the offset is used to facilitate link database compression" to Shiigi's and Iizuka's system in order to provide a method of efficiently storing web applications.

Claim 15:

Shiigi and Iizuka do not explicitly disclose "wherein each said single entry further includes a number indicating the length of said page map. "

However Burrows discloses 0004 that if the number of web pages in the network is large, the amount of memory required to store the url's and links in the web database will be correspondingly large. Further disclosing 0041 there is the ability to put a limit on the length of reference chains for decompressing a row.

Shiigi, Iizuka, and Burrows are all directed to web enabled systems. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Burrow's teachings of "0004 that if the number of web pages in the network is large, the amount of memory required to store the url's and links in the web database will be correspondingly large. Further disclosing 0041 there is the ability to put a limit on the length of reference chains for decompressing a row" to Shiigi's and Iizuka's system in order to provide a method of efficiently storing web applications.

Claim 16:

Shiiga and Iizuka as modified disclose, "wherein at least one said page map includes a plurality of entries" (Iizuka, figure 12, see table entries) ", each of said plurality of entries pointing to a corresponding one of said tabular data lists" (Iizuka, figure 12, see columns 2-4. columns 2-4 corresponds to tabular data lists.).

Shiigi and Iizuka do not explicitly disclose "each of said plurality of entries includes an offset from a first listed data element and a number of listed data elements in said corresponding one"

However Burrows, 0065, discloses an offset for a corresponding row. Further disclosing that the offset is used to facilitate link database compression.

Shiigi, Iizuka, and Burrows are all directed to web enabled systems. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Burrow's teachings of "0065, discloses an offset for a corresponding row. Further disclosing that the offset is used to facilitate link database compression" to Shiigi's and Iizuka's system in order to provide a method of efficiently storing web applications.

Claim 18:

Shiigi and Iizuka do not explicitly disclose "wherein each said single entry further includes a number indicating the length of said page map. "

However Burrows discloses 0004 that if the number of web pages in the network is large, the amount of memory required to store the url's and links in the web database will be correspondingly large. Further disclosing 0041 there is the ability to put a limit on the length of reference chains for decompressing a row.

Shiigi, Iizuka, and Burrows are all directed to web enabled systems. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Burrow's teachings of "0004 that if the number of web pages in the network is large, the amount of memory required to store the url's and links in the web database will be correspondingly large. Further disclosing 0041 there is the ability to put a limit on the length of reference chains for decompressing a row" to Shiigi's and Iizuka's system in order to provide a method of efficiently storing web applications.

Claim 19:

Shiigi and Iizuka do not explicitly disclose "wherein each entry in each said page map includes an offset pointing to a corresponding one of said tabular data lists and a number of listed data elements in said corresponding one."

However Burrows, 0065, discloses an offset for a corresponding row. Further disclosing that the offset is used to facilitate link database compression.

Shiigi, Iizuka, and Burrows are all directed to web enabled systems. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Burrow's teachings of "0065, discloses an offset for a corresponding row. Further disclosing that the offset is used to facilitate link database compression" to Shiigi's and Iizuka's system in order to provide a method of efficiently storing web applications.

5. **Claims 9, 10, 12, 15-16, 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 2003/0014442 by Shiigi et. al. (hereafter Shiigi) further in view of U.S. Patent 6,424,980 by**

Iizuka et. al. (hereafter Iizuka) and U.S. Patent 6,714,931 by Papierniak et. al. (hereafter Papierniak).

Claim 9:

Shiigi and Iizuka do not explicitly disclose “wherein adding HTML template files increases the size of each of said data generation module and said page generation module only by the length of a corresponding said single entry for each said added HTML template file.”

However, Papierniak discloses col. 9 lines 19-21, that a page map contains a plurality of data records. That each of the records also stores a combined length for all the bytes sent for the web page file and the other type files. Thereby suggesting adding (combined) html template files increases the size of each of said data generation module and said page generation module only by the length of a corresponding said single entry for each said added html template file (combined length of bytes sent for the web page file).

Shiigi, Iizuka, and Papierniak are all directed towards web enabled systems. Therefore all are within the same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Papierniak’s disclosure of combined length for all bytes sent for the web page file and other type files to Shiigi’s and Iizuka’s disclosure for the purpose of determining the cost of files.

Claim 10:

Shiigi and Iizuka do not explicitly disclose “wherein each said single entry further includes a number indicating the length of said page map.”

However, Papierniak discloses col. 9 lines 19-21, that a page map contains a plurality of data records. That each of the records also stores a combined length for all the bytes sent for the web page file and the other type files (i.e. length of page map).

Shiigi, Iizuka, and Papierniak are all directed towards web enabled systems. Therefore all are within the same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Papierniak's disclosure of combined length for all bytes sent for the web page file and other type files to Shiigi's and Iizuka's disclosure for the purpose of determining the cost of files.

Claim 12:

Shiigi and Iizuka do not explicitly disclose "wherein each entry in said plurality of entries includes an offset from a first listed data element and a number of listed data elements in said corresponding one."

However, Papierniak discloses col. 9 lines 19-21, that a page map contains a plurality of data records. Each of the records also stores ip address (e.g. offset) used to retrieve web page file, a time stamp indicating the time at which a request was recieved.

Shiigi, Iizuka, and Papierniak are all directed towards web enabled systems. Therefore all are within the same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Papierniak's disclosure storing an ip address or time stamp indicating time to Shiigi's and Iizuka's disclosure for the purpose of retrieving the correct set of files.

Claim 15:

Shiigi and Iizuka do not explicitly disclose "wherein each said single entry further includes a number indicating the length of said page map. "

However, Papierniak discloses col. 9 lines 19-21, that a page map contains a plurality of data records. That each of the records also stores a combined length for all the bytes sent for the web page file and the other type files (i.e. length of page map).

Shiigi, Iizuka, and Papierniak are all directed towards web enabled systems. Therefore all are within the same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to apply Papierniak's disclosure of combined length for all bytes sent for the web page file and other type files to Shiigi's and Iizuka's disclosure for the purpose of determining the cost of files.

Claim 16:

Shiiga and Iizuka as modified disclose, "wherein at least one said page map includes a plurality of entries" (Iizuka, figure 12, see table entries) "each of said plurality of entries pointing to a corresponding one of said tabular data lists" (Iizuka, figure 12, see columns 2-4. columns 2-4 corresponds to tabular data lists.).

Shiigi and Iizuka do not explicitly disclose "each of said plurality of entries includes an offset from a first listed data element and a number of listed data elements in said corresponding one"

However, Papierniak discloses col. 9 lines 19-21, that a page map contains a plurality of data records. Each of the records also stores ip address (e.g. offset) used to retrieve web page file, a time stamp indicating the time at which a request was recieved.

Shiigi, Iizuka, and Papierniak are all directed towards web enabled systems. Therefore all are within the same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Papierniak's disclosure storing an ip address or time stamp indicating time to Shiigi's and Iizuka's disclosure for the purpose of retrieving the correct set of files.

Claim 18:

Shiigi and Iizuka do not explicitly disclose "wherein each said single entry further includes a number indicating the length of said page map. "

However, Papierniak discloses col. 9 lines 19-21, that a page map contains a plurality of data records. That each of the records also stores a combined length for all the bytes sent for the web page file and the other type files (i.e. length of page map).

Shiigi, Iizuka, and Papierniak are all directed towards web enabled systems. Therefore all are within the same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Papierniak's disclosure of combined length for all bytes sent for the web page file and other type files to Shiigi's and Iizuka's disclosure for the purpose of determining the cost of files.

Claim 19:

Shiigi and Iizuka do not explicitly disclose "wherein each entry in each said page map includes an offset pointing to a corresponding one of said tabular data lists and a number of listed data elements in said corresponding one."

However, Papierniak discloses col. 9 lines 19-21, that a page map contains a plurality of data records. Each of the records also stores ip address (e.g. offset) used to retrieve web page file, a time stamp indicating the time at which a request was recieved.

Shiigi, Iizuka, and Papierniak are all directed towards web enabled systems. Therefore all are within the same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Papierniak's disclosure storing an ip address or time stamp indicating time to Shiigi's and Iizuka's disclosure for the purpose of retrieving the correct set of files.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 9/4/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's assert the following:

A. The cited reference does not teach "a data generation module generating variable data for display", recited in independent claims. The reason being placeholders are hardly variable data. Nor necessarily, "text, graphics, video or animation files" are variable data. Nor does Shiigi

Art Unit: 2167

teach or suggest generating content objects by a data generation module, especially from raw system data.

In response the examiner disagrees limitation "a data generation module generating variable data for display" is not taught for the reason being that a variable data is nothing more than data. Variable data as stated is nothing more than data. As long as some data is disclosed. It meets the claimed limitation. In this case, the generation module generating variable data is an object model that creates content objects. Those objects represent different types of content elements that are to appear on the web pages. Therefore, the objects are variable pieces of data.

B. The cited references do not teach "each said single entry for each of said ones pointing to a corresponding repeatable data structure and a page map for tabular data lists in said corresponding repeatable data structure, said tabular data lists being displayed as a table on a generated said HTML document" recited in the independent claims.

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees that the limitation "each said single entry for each of said ones pointing to a corresponding repeatable data structure and a page map for tabular data lists in said corresponding repeatable data structure, said tabular data lists being displayed as a table on a generated said HTML document" is not disclosed.

To further clarify, figure 12 discloses each single entry for each of said ones pointing (rows of figure 12) to a corresponding repeatable data structure (figure 9B, <TD></TD>; col. 15 lines 55-62) and page map for tabular lists in said corresponding repeatable data structures (figure 12, row 1 maps to Shop_A), said tabular lists being displayed as a table on a generated html document (figure 9A).

C. The Burrows reference does not teach “adding HTML template files increases the size of each of said data generation module and said page generation module only by the length of a corresponding said single entry for each said added html template file” in dependent claim 9.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees that Burrows does not teach “adding HTML template files increases the size of each of said data generation module and said page generation module only by the length of a corresponding said single entry for each said added html template”.

Burrows discloses 0004 that if the number of web pages in the network is large, the amount of memory required to store the url's and links in the web database will be correspondingly large. Further disclosing 0041 there is the ability to put a limit on the length of reference chains for decompressing a row.

To further clarify, Burrows suggests the limitation adding HTML template files (0004, webpages) increases the size of each of said data generation module and said page generation module (0004, urls and links) only by the length (0041, length) of a corresponding single entry for each said added html template (0004, correspondingly large).

Art Unit: 2167

Burrows only by the length of a corresponding single entry for each said added html template is unpersuasive because as webpages are added the length correspondingly increases.

D. Papierniak also does not disclose “adding HTML template files increases the size of each of said data generation module and said page generation module only by the length of a corresponding said single entry for each said added html template” in dependent claim 9. Specifically asserting page 12 second to last paragraph which cites col. 9 lines 19-21.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees that Papierniak does not teach “adding HTML template files increases the size of each of said data generation module and said page generation module only by the length of a corresponding said single entry for each said added html template”.

To further clarify, Papierniak suggests adding html template files (see figure 5 webpage files; col. 10 lines 16-18, forms page map) increases the size of each of said data generation module (figure 4 element 402, server log) and page generation module (figure 5 page map) only by the length of a corresponding said single entry for each said added html template (col. 9 line 41, combine length of all bytes sent. and figure 5, page map is the length of each added html template).

In other words, the length of the server log increases with each webpage file, and further, the page map increases with each webpage file. Accordingly, the claimed limitation is suggested.

Art Unit: 2167

E. 10, 12, 15, 16, and 19 are not disclosed because independent claims and dependent claim 9 are not disclosed.

In response, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Dependent claims are further rejected for having dependency to already rejected claims.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record listed on PTO-892 and not relied, if any, upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael D. Pham whose telephone number is (571)272-3924. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am - 5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2167

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Pham
Art Unit 2167
Examiner *MP*

ey Cam Y.
Cam Y. Truong
Art Unit 2162
Primary Examiner

John Cottingham
Art Unit 2167
Supervisor

Application/Control Number: 10/690,883
Art Unit: 2167

Page 25